



# UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 8  
999 18<sup>TH</sup> STREET - SUITE 500  
DENVER, CO 80202-2466

March 3, 1999

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Ref: 8EPR-SR

## MEMORANDUM

TO: File

FROM: Jim Christiansen, RPM

*3/3/99*

SUBJECT: 3/2/99 Meeting with United Park City Mines ref: Richardson Flats

This memo is to document a meeting between EPA, United Park City Mines (UPCM), and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) held at EPA in Denver on 3/2/99. The meeting was attended by:

Matthew Cohn	ENF-L
Greg Phoebe	ENF-T
Jim Christiansen	EPR-SR
Norval Schoenhals	EPR-SR
Brad Johnson	UDEQ
Hank Rothwell	CEO, UPCM
Kerry Gee	VP, UPCM
Kevin Murray	Environmental counsel, UPCM
Jim Fricke	Consultant to UPCM
Consultant from Weston Engineering	

The meeting was held at the request of Kevin Murray to discuss a possible agreement to perform investigations, remediate, and develop the Richardson Flats Tailings Site. UPCM has expressed interest in developing the site as a 27 hole golf course.

Hank summarized UPCM's development concerns and interests. The consultants presented some technical information describing conditions at the site. There was also some discussion concerning the nature of a possible agreement and the type of processes available (removal or remedial).

UPCM stated the following points:

- UPCM desires an expedited process and would like to avoid a costly RI/FS. No set times have been established, but it would be desirable to have work substantially completed



before the 2002 Olympics. They have limited financial resources and, thus, it is important for them to be able to redevelop as part of the remediation process.

- Negotiations will fail if EPA attempts to finalize the site on the NPL; however, UPCM understands EPA cannot give written agreement not to do so.
- UPCM seeks a relief from liability for the site; however, they are currently unclear how best to pursue this. UPCM also seeks the site to be archived or removed from CERCLIS.

EPA stated the following points:

- EPA cannot make an agreement with UPCM NOT to go final on the NPL. This ensures EPA is able to access remedial action funds if needed in the future. However, we have no immediate plans or intentions to go final. EPA understands that any attempt to finalize the site on the NPL will likely result in a breakdown of negotiations.
- EPA will attempt to work with UPCM to expedite and simplify whatever process is chosen; however, certain requirements must be met under the law which may prevent UPCM from moving as expeditiously as desired.
- EPA acknowledges that a great deal of information is already available to characterize the site. This will encourage quicker completion of an RI. EPA also acknowledges that given the current information, the proposed scenario seems reasonable and attractive to EPA. However, EPA is unable to give any assurances to that end except through a legal agreement. UDEQ concurred on this generalization and added the Utah Voluntary Cleanup Program would not apply to this site at the present time.
- EPA suggests that the remedial process is the most acceptable process to begin addressing the Site. This will allow more "finalization" with respect to PRP liability than the removal process. This also allows consideration of future land use when evaluating cleanup standards. Designation of future land use (with no residential) will make the RI/FS process more simple and cleanup standards less stringent.
- EPA will research how finality is achieved with a PROPOSED NPL site. Will the site be NFRAPd? Should we go final on the NPL ONLY to delete the site from the NPL?

No agreements were reached but it appears the discussion will move forward. I agreed to work with Kerry Gee to more fully explore EPA requirements for preparation of a possible RI work plan and AOC to conduct an RI/FS.